

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21, 23 and 24 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claim 4 has been canceled from the application without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11-16, 19 and 22-24 remain pending. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview on October 15, 2009 regarding the above-identified application. In the interview, the Examiner indicated that the amendments presented herein render the pending claims patentably distinct over Nieh et al. and Homer et al., individually or in combination. However, the Examiner requested Applicant file an Amendment to enter such amendments and also to comment of patentable distinctness from Santoro et al., U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0020671.

### **Patentability of Claims**

Applicant comments on patentability of the claimed invention over Santoro et al.

Claim 1 pertains to a method for managing tasks performed on a computer capable of coupling over a network to a network-based media server. According to claim 1, tasks to be performed are received from a single client media player program that operates on a computer and the tasks involve interaction of the client media player program with a media server over a network. The method activates an operation at the client media player program to respond to each of the tasks, and coordinates performance of the activated operations at the client media player program in accordance with priority levels associated with the different media-based actions of the tasks. Further, claim 1 states that "the priority levels of the different media-based

actions being user-modifiable based on user interaction with the client media player application program.”

Santoro et al. describes “a graphical user interface which organizes content from a variety of information sources into a grid of tiles, each of which can refresh its content independently of the others.” “According to one embodiment, the method ... allocates refresh rates to tiles according to priorities that are assigned based on identifiers such as quality of service (QoS) tags....” Santoro et al., abstract.

Fig. 12 of Santoro et al. illustrates a grid object 700. The “grid manages the flow of information to the titles.” Santoro et al., para. [0100]. At para. [0101] of Santoro et al. it is further stated: “In a preferred embodiment, according to priorities that may be applied to individual tiles on a title by title basis if desired, the grid manages the refresh rate of each tile in the grid.” Also, at para. [0102], Santoro et al. states: “In another embodiment, the grid itself assigns priorities to the tiles based on identifiers such as quality of service tags that are associated with the information source itself. In still another embodiment, the grid automatically assigns priorities to the tiles based upon its recognition of the type of data that is presented to it.”

In Santoro et al. tiles of a grid provide a graphical user interface. The grid assigns priorities to the tiles so as to independently control refresh rates. However, the tiles in Santoro et al. are not themselves “different media-based actions” as recited in claim 1. Moreover, as noted above, claim 1 recites “the priority levels of the different media-based actions being user-modifiable based on user interaction with the client media player application program.” In contrast, Santoro et al. does not teach or suggest that priorities of its tiles are able to user-modifiable.

Still further, claim 1 recites a task manager computer program implemented within the single client media player application program. Santoro et al. lacks any teaching or suggestion for a task manager computer program. For example, Santoro et al. provides a URL loader but such merely manages acquisition of content for the tiles. Specifically, Fig. 15 illustrates a URL loader 1510 and a connection manager/bandwidth controller 1512. As stated in paragraph [0119] of Santoro et al., the “URL loader 1510 decides whether content should be obtained afresh by contacting the connection

manager 1512, or from content previously stored in cache. Effectively, the URL loader manages the connection manager, and calls functions within it.” Hence, the URL loader in Santoro et al. fails to teach or suggest the task manager computer program recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinct from Santoro et al. In addition, claim 11 pertains to a computer readable medium that can operate similar to the method discussed above regarding claim 1. As such, for at least reasons similar to those noted above with respect to claim 1, it is submitted that claim 11 is also patentably distinct from Santoro et al.

Still further, claim 23 pertains to a computer for presenting media to its user. The computer includes a single client media application program operable to enable the user to play, browse, preview, purchase, download and present media items for the benefit of the user. A task manager “manages performance of at least browse, preview, purchase and download operations by assigning user-modifiable priority levels to each of the browse, preview, purchase and download operations, and managing performance of the browse, preview, purchase and download operations in accordance with the assigned user-modifiable priority levels.” Hence, in claim 23, a client media application operates in view of user-modifiable priorities levels assigned to each of the browse, preview, purchase and download operations. Hence, for at least some of the reasons similar to those noted above, it is submitted that claim 23 is also patentably distinct from Santoro et al.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 11 and 23 are patentably distinct from Santoro et al. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from Santoro et al.

## **Summary**

It is submitted that claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11-16, 19 and 22-24 are patentably distinct from Santoro et al. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If it is determined that additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 504298 (Order No. 101-P271).

Respectfully submitted,

/C. Douglass Thomas/

C. Douglass Thomas  
Reg. No. 32,947

TI Law Group  
19200 Stevens Creek Blvd., Suite 240  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
408-252-9991  
408-252-9993 (fax)